# Concept Issues

## 30April 2004

**Col Pat Shaw**
**JS/J7/JTD**

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- ✓ **J7: Start with TOR for use with JOpsC 2.0, new JOCs, new JICs, (new JFCs??) (incorporate into JCCIP, JOpsC 2.0, 3170)**
  - ✓ **TOR Contents—timelines/milestones, responsibilities, purpose, central idea, template, concept interface with JCIDS, limited Lexicon**
- ✓ **Comprehensive Lexicon (location?)**
- ✓ **Clarify concept roles and relationships**
- ✓ **Establish a deliberate process for identifying, selecting and approving new concepts**
- ✓ **GOFO participation early and often**
- ✓ **Concept updates s/b scheduled; updates s/b informed by CBA, LL, and Experimentation**
- ✓ **Establish a standing feedback organization**
- ✓ **Establish deliberate integration mechanism to include responsibilities; *enforcer***
- ✓ **Clarify the JFCOM role—concept integrator?**
- ✓ **ID relationship of concepts to the doctrine development process**
- ✓ ***Avoid concurrent concept development***
- ✓ ***Enforce JS-136 process***

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments:**
  - **Continue the Comment Resolution Conferences (USMC)**
  - **OpsDeps and JCS provided valuable course/speed and insight during concept development (USMC)**
  - ✓ **TOR is needed, approved by JROC & vetted through Svcs and COCOMs. It should include Purpose, Central Idea, Framework (campaign-like construct) common definitions and POA&M (Example: Enhanced Network Seabasing (USMC)**
  - **Keep a collaborative environment . Keep Service equities incorporated. (USN).**
  - ✓ **Develop a JOpsC family standardized template (TOR) that identifies a concept hierarchy, ensure standardization between authors for JOCs and JICs. (USN)**

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - **Published timelines and milestones help focus the effort. (USAF)**
  - **Establish a deliberate process for identifying, selecting and approving new concepts (Initial AO conference, followed by early commander involvement (USAF)**
  - ✓ **There needs to be stronger capabilities linkage. Need to agree on the 'how' before we identify the required capabilities. The link needs to include effect desired, what tasks are needed to create the effect, and what capabilities are required to accomplish the task. (USAF)**
  - **The Coordination Process needs improvement. Joint Staff should own the process, using the JS Form 136. New versions should not be released during formal coordination. Concepts should not be emailed directly to the principles outside of the 136 process -- it creates confusion. A comment feedback loop is required. (USAF)**
  - **The timeline is driving the development leading to a lower quality document. Wargaming should be used to to actually further develop the concept. After each event we should hold a writing conference to incorporate changes identified. (USAF)**
  - **Avoid midstream alternatives and changes from anyone. It hurts the development effort. All JOCs/JICs must include granularity in describing Service lanes of responsibility. (USN)**

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - **Keep the combatant commander's perspective (USA).**
  - ✓ **Recommend a TOR to clarify/revise guidance; it should indicate who's in charge, how joint concepts interface with JCIDS, provide common definitions and delineate the scope and format for each concept. (USA)**
  - **Establish a standing feedback organization (including Services) that meets regularly to continuously monitor/assess ongoing work to make the process better/quicker. (USA)**
  - **Establish a deliberate integration mechanism (website?) and a joint campaign framework to support integration of joint concepts and associated capabilities. (USA)**
  - ***Maintain Senior level Forums for sharing ideas. Get OSD in early. (STRATCOM)***
  - ***DART Red Team helped—keep it; give it greater responsibility. Process needs an (external) arbiter with authority to direct effort. CON: COCOMs aren't manned to write a JOC. (Service) Coordination needed to be forced. Need a better standard of how these documents are constructed and staffed; there was too much discussion and not enough direction.***
  - ***Clarify the JFCOM role. JFCOM should be a supporting (not supported) COCOM (STRATCOM).***

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - ✓ **Keep Robust Senior Leader level involvement (2 star and above) to supplement addition to the 136 staffing process, but promote "concept development through experimentation“ over "concept development through staffing." (JFCOM)**
  - ✓ **Exploit access to leading minds (Mr. Newt Gingrich, Rupert Smith, Field Commanders in Iraq, Dr. Alberts, Dr. Hayes, Chas Holler…) (JFCOM)**
  - ✓ **Expand Discovery experimentation (PI03 and Co-Sponsored events) coupled with Lessons Learned from current ops to help establish concept foundation (JFCOM)**
  - – **Establish experimentation expectations for the different versions. (JFCOM)**
  - – **Avoid a “shotgun” approach to second round of concepts. (JFCOM)**
  - – **Conduct a fresh-look methodical mission and functional analysis of the mission space. (JFCOM)**
  - – **Develop a way to distribute experiment effort that meets needs of joint community and of individual experimenting organization. (JFCOM)**
  - – **Continue Co-Sponsored events. (JFCOM)**
  - – **Develop easily iterated constructive and virtual experimentation capability at JFCOM. (JFCOM)**

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - ✓ **Finalize the JOpsC portfolio . ID where/how concepts fit in the JCIDS process, with clear definitions. Clearly define the way ahead. Standardize terminology/definitions. Clarify role, relationship, and responsibilities of JOCs, JFCs, Service/Enabling Concepts, JICS, Joint and Service Roadmaps, and integrated architectures. Once defined, obtain consensus across DOD. (NORTHCOM)**
  - ✓ **Establish clear Guidance (role and relationships of Service Concepts; Enabling Concepts; JICs) and avoid changing it. (NORTHCOM)**
  - – **Avoid concurrent concept development and emerging strategic guidance and policy. (NORTHCOM)**
  - – **ID relationship of concepts to the doctrine development process (e.g., use of JOPSC/HLS JOC concepts in JP 3-26). (NORTHCOM)**
  - – **Clarify the Degree (and venue) of desired future capabilities. (NORTHCOM)**

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - **Keep the Warfighter perspective (JUSS)**
  - **Differentiate between Tasks and Capabilities (JUSS)**
  - ✓ **A JIC template is needed greatly—Outline/format/guidance (JUSS)**
  - ***Institute a more rigorous task analysis/framework, with specific language. Show how one would execute a JIC (like JFEO). Keep JIC definitions narrow. (JFEO)***
  - ***Maintain closer coordination of JIC writing group. (JFEO)***
  - ✓ ***A JIC template is needed greatly—Outline/format/guidance (JFEO)***

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - **Establish the vision. Staffing is necessary. Focus on attributes and Metrics. (BA JFC)**
  - **Don't use current staffing. Assign portfolio responsibility across the staffs to develop a truly functional structure. ( BA JFC)**
  - **Simultaneous JOC, JFC and JIC development breeds confusion. Complete JOCs and JICs before the next round of JFCs. ( BA JFC)**
  - **Establish a common framework for cross walking issues. Develop a common task framework that is not architecture based. (BA JFC)**
  - ***Maintain [critical] comment resolution conferences. Keep the DART conference concept, but try for standardization across [functional] concepts. (JC2 JFC)***
  - ***Establish a Lexicon. Establish a formal concept integration process to describe interrelationships and standardize similar attributes/capabilities. Provide consistent guidance. Keep metrics in the next version. FC/JOC writers need visibility into JIC development. (JC2 JFC)***

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - **Keep the DART approach. Maintain GO/FO presence in the DART. Give the DART a prep to ensure they are spun up for the actual conference (P JFC)**
  - **136 staffing is good, but insist on a GO/FO cover memo to accompany the comments. Keep the Concept Resolution Conference mechanism. (P JFC)**
  - **Avoid simultaneous concept development. Agree on a single taxonomy. Better planning is required to identify the way ahead and avoid continuous changes in the process. (P JFC)**
  - **ID the level of detail required of each concept. (P JFC)**
  - ***Revisit JFC attributes—define them. ID who will assess relationship of one FC to other FCs. (FA JFC)***
  - ***Doctrine is too limiting (Joint Fires definition is terrible). Recommend elevating futuristic definitions into DOCTRINE. Consider Joint doctrine 'match.' (FA FCB)***
  - ***Consider operational and strategic level metrics (FA JFC)***

# Issue: Concept Development Process Improvements

- **Comments :**
  - ***Publish standards for concepts. Build an accepted set of definitions. (FA JFC)***
  - ***JICs/JOCs need to 're-bin' functional tasks capabilities. Revise JICs/JOCs reflecting capabilities outlined in functional concepts.***
  - ***If nothing else is done, get JOCs and JFCs out of simultaneous development. (FA JFC)***
  - ***Put things into JCIDS to avoid irrelevance. (FA JFC)***
  - **Enforce the 136 process. GO/FO coord is GO/FO coord. (FL FCB)**
  - **Define concept to concept relationships up front. (Use Tiger Team matrix) (FL FCB)**

# *Issue: Lexicon*

- **Terms for inclusion in TOR (not comprehensive)**
  - **Task**
  - **Capability**
  - **Integration**

# *Issue: ??*

- **J7:**
- **Alternative**
  - **Comments**

# Issue: Concept Linkage to DPS

- **J7: Not direct; happens via J7 / J8 and concept author participation in DPS and MSFD Blue CONOPS development; assisted by JOCs having campaign plan structure and focus on ends / effects**
- **Alternative: Develop a mechanism to integrate concepts with development of DPSs and experimentation. We must ensure that the thread of joint concepts is maintained through related DPSs and experimentation to ensure commonality/validity of outputs. (USA)**

# Issue: Concept Development Responsibilities

- **JOpsC**
  - J7: CJCS (J7)
  - **Alternative:**
- **JOCs**
  - J7: COCOMs
  - **Alternative:**
- **JFCs**
  - J7: FCBs
  - **Alternative:**
- **JICs**
  - J8: COCOMs or Services
  - **Alternative:**
  - **Is the warfighter the right player to think about future concept? (JUSS)**

# Issue: Initial / Periodic Validation of Concepts

- **General Comments**
  - ***Is JFCOM the supporting COCOM for JOCs/JICs, or is he the supported? JFCOM role in not well understood. (STRATCOM)***
  - ***How will these concepts be validated and experimented upon?(STRATCOM)***
- **JOpsC**
  - **J7: SecDef / CJCS**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JOCs**
  - **J7: JCS Tank**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JFCs**
  - **J7: JROC validates attributes and capabilities**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JICs**
  - **J7: JCS Tank**
  - **Alternative:**

# Issue: Purpose/Content of Each Concept

- **General Comments**
  - **General consensus has developed throughout the community on the inherent need to integrate and synchronize the family of concepts within a common campaign construct. (USA)**
  - **The lack of a deliberate integration mechanism and the lack of a joint campaign framework impedes our ability to integrate. (USA)**
  - **Recommend a TOR that delineates the scope and format for each type of concept. Once TOR is approved, recommend JIC writers get briefed on the standards so they know what is expected. (USA)**
  - **Conceptual framework provides solid foundation to develop the concepts and capabilities (USAF)**
- **JOpsC**
  - **J7: Governs subordinate concepts IAW strategic guidance; Contains attributes of transforming joint force, joint concept framework, future context, lexicon.**
  - **The future JOpsC requires a joint campaign framework around which subordinate concepts are written. (USA)**
  - **While the JOpsC delivers a context for the process of concept development, it fails to provide an operating context. Recommend including a global campaign construct in the update (JFCOM)**

# Issue: Purpose/Content of Each Concept

- **JOCs**
  - **J7: Shapes JICs, DPS, and JE; Describes required effects (operational ends), provides campaign plan structure and operational context.**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JFCs**
  - **J7: Shapes JICs, DPS, and JE; Describes required capabilities (functional means), provides functional context.**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JICs**
  - **J7: Integrates JFC capabilities to achieve JOC effects and breaks both down to tasks and measures for input to CBA process; Contains CONOPS to answer a specific scenario.**
  - **Alternative:**

# Issue: Concepts Linkage to JCIDS

- **General Comments**
  - **The JOpsC and the revised JCIDS Instruction are insufficient in describing role of joint/Service concepts and relationship to JCIDS.(USA)**
  - **Recommend: Determine and specify role of Service concepts in the JCIDs process. (USA)**
- **JOpsC**
  - **J7: Indirect through subordinate concepts**
  - **Alternative:**

# Issue: Concepts Linkage to JCIDS

- **JOCs**
  - **J7: Broad required effects**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JFCs**
  - **J7: Broad required capabilities**
  - **Alternative:**
- **JICs**
  - **J7: Detailed tasks & measures to support CBA, gap identification, risk assessments, and resource decisions**
  - **Alternative:**